

must stand up for human rights and the rule of law, even when—especially when—they are undermined by major international players. We cannot remain silent when journalists and activists are killed or savagely beaten with impunity, while political prisoners face years of jail time.

The new guilty verdict imposed on Mikhail Khodorkovsky late last year makes it appear that the only crime that's actually punishable in the Russian Federation is opposition to Putin. Days after the verdict was handed down, opposition leader and former Prime Minister Boris Nemtsov was arrested for participating in a peaceful rally. He had committed the grave offense of expressing support for the protection of constitutional rights and condemning the sham Khodorkovsky verdict.

Hostility to the rule of law extends beyond Russia's own borders, as we saw in the August 2008 invasion of our democratic ally Georgia. It was reprehensible. Georgia's sovereignty and territorial integrity remain under threat today.

In our relationship with Moscow, we must learn to balance the twin imperatives of effective engagement and criticism of gross miscarriages of justice. This will only become more essential in the context of the coming debate on Russia's entry into the World Trade Organization. Russia has moved closer than ever to acceding to the WTO. We are likely to face this prospect in the coming year and the resulting vote on whether to extend Permanent Normal Trade Relations.

We will need to have a full and robust debate on this issue. We will need to ensure that PNTR is not granted until we have confirmed that Russia has fulfilled the basic obligations that WTO membership demands. If those obligations are met, my view is the WTO accession would be a very positive step forward. Bringing Russia into a rules-based trading system would bind Moscow to the rule of law. It would create consequences and enforcement mechanisms for failure to live by its commitments.

WTO membership is by no means a panacea, particularly for symptoms as deeply flawed as Russia's, but it would be a significant step in the right direction. Not only would it impose the rule of law in Russia's trading relationships, it would demonstrate that even Moscow recognizes the value of international rules of fairness. This should serve as a reminder that their presumed indifference to our criticism is no excuse for failing to voice that criticism.

We need to engage with Russia, but Russia also needs to engage with us. We cannot shy away from taking a public stand against increasingly brutal repression at the hands of those with whom we have important negotiations. Neither can we lose sight of the fact that supporting the rule of law is not just about promoting American ideals.

□ 1850

One of the most important lessons of the last decade is that democracy strengthening is as firmly grounded in realpolitik as it is steeped in lofty, high-minded ideals. If our moral clarity helps to strengthen democracy advocates in Russia, we will further our strategic goals in the long run. A less corrupt, less autocratic regime in Moscow will result in a better international partner.

As Vladimir Kara-Murza has written in *World Affairs*, defending the rule of law is not just our right but our duty. Last week, Vladimir wrote that statutes of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, to which both the U.S. and Russia are party, make this clear. The statutes state, "issues relating to human rights, fundamental freedoms, democracy, and the rule of law are of international concern."

It is absolutely imperative, Mr. Speaker, that we do absolutely everything that we can to strengthen this relationship but pursue the rule of law.

THE GOLDEN RULE OF TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, before all of the pomp and circumstance of tonight's State dinner honoring Chinese President Hu Jintao, a closed-door meeting took place between President Obama, the Chinese President, and the power brokers from some of the largest global corporations that seem to create more jobs outside this country than inside it: Steve Ballmer of Microsoft; Jeffrey Immelt of General Electric; Jim McNerney of Boeing; David Rubenstein of the Carlyle Group; Ellenn Kullman, the CEO of DuPont. And many greedy Wall Street bankers showed up: John Thornton, the chairman of HSBC Holdings; and Lloyd Blankfein, my gosh, the chief executive officer of Goldman Sachs—where have we heard about them before?—whose imprudent firms are responsible for the economic meltdown that the rest of America is trying to dig out of as we speak tonight.

Too often, these international corporations and megabanks have taken America's ingenuity and hard work that were built with so much effort and shipped them overseas, destroying American jobs and ballooning our half trillion dollar trade deficit.

China remains a communist country, and it is a command-and-control economy described as "Market Leninism"—not free enterprise. Yes, China's people should be able to develop their land and their economy and improve their lives. They surely need it. But their growth should not come at the expense of American jobs and our businesses and our workers.

The moment has arrived to deal with China as the great economic power

that it is and proceed on the basis of reciprocity. If a treaty affects our companies one way, we'll treat them the same way. If they exclude our investments and our imports, we will exclude their investments and their imports. We should give them the exact same deal as they give us. That is the Golden Rule of trade.

While we wish China well, we must defend the interests of jobs in our country, and even more, the highest political ideals to which we aspire. And our highest calling is freedom.

It is not a coincidence that America's trade deficit with Communist China has ballooned since China entered the World Trade Organization in 2001. The trade deficit for 2010 with China and the United States alone stood at \$253 billion—a quarter of a trillion dollars.

Since 2001, jobs in our country in manufacturing decreased by 25 percent. And according to the U.S. Department of Commerce, for every billion dollars of trade deficit we maintain, 5,405 American jobs are lost. This means in 2010 alone, over 1,400,000 more jobs were lost in our country attributable just to our trade deficit with China. This is a major factor in the weakness that our economy is suffering.

China consistently disregards international trade laws. She manipulates her currency, and she does nothing to protect American intellectual property. In fact, of all of the products seized at the U.S. border for infringement of intellectual property rights in 2009, 79 percent were from China.

Communist China's illegal subsidies and no-interest loans to Chinese companies have put American firms at a serious competitive disadvantage. In fact, there's a new 15-year tax holiday for solar companies. And a major firm in Massachusetts just announced it's closing its doors and going to China.

Dumping of products like steel pipes cripple the American steel industry. And earlier today, the White House announced China will purchase 200 Boeing aircraft. Isn't that convenient. A few airplanes. It's great to hear, but positive press releases for one-time purchases will do nothing to erase the \$253 billion deficit that grows with China every year.

Holding China accountable and creating an environment where Communist China's best interest is to follow international trade laws, to protect intellectual property rights, to stop illegal subsidies and no-interest loans to Chinese companies, and to further work to create a level playing field for all is in the hands of the Obama administration, the new majority in this House, and our colleagues in the Senate.

Congress and the administration must stand up most importantly for freedom and the rule of law. For American businesses and our workers and our economy to prosper, we have to hold Communist China accountable to the Golden Rule. And that means reciprocity, not Market Leninism.

WATER, WATER EVERYWHERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Interior issued an announcement yesterday that perfectly illustrates the irrationality of our current approach to water issues.

California's precipitation this season has gone off the charts. Statewide, snow water content is 198 percent of normal. The all-important northern Sierra snowpack is 174 percent of normal. This is not only a wet year, it is one of the wettest years on record.

Yet yesterday, we have this announcement from the Department of the Interior that despite a nearly unprecedented abundance of water, the Bureau of Reclamation will only guarantee delivery of 45 percent of the central valley of California's contracted water supply south of the Delta. This is the same percentage they received last year that had barely average rainfall.

This is of crucial importance to the entire Nation since the central valley of California is one of the largest producers of our Nation's food supply. California produces half of the U.S. grown fruits and nuts and vegetables on the Nation's grocery shelves, and the prices you pay are directly affected by the California harvest.

The deliberate decision by this administration in 2009 and 2010 to divert hundreds of billions of gallons of water away from the central valley destroyed a quarter million acres of the most productive farmland in America, it threw tens of thousands of families into unemployment, and it affected grocery prices across the country.

At the time the administration blamed a mild drought but never explained why a drought justified their decision to pour 200 billion gallons of water that we did have directly into the Pacific Ocean. In a rational world, a drought means that you are more careful not to waste the water that you have.

Of course, the real reason for this irrational policy is that they were indulging the environmental left's pet cause, a 3-inch minnow called the Delta Smelt. Diverting precious water to the Delta Smelt habitat was considered more important than producing the food that feeds the country and preserving the jobs that produce the food.

But that issue is now moot. This year we have nearly twice the normal water supply at this point in the season, and yet the Department of the Interior will allow less than half of the normal water deliveries to California's central valley agriculture south of the Delta.

The difference comes to 1.1 million acre-feet of water.

Now, consider this. Since December 1, the Central Valley Project has released 1.4 million acre-feet more water into the Pacific Ocean than they did just last year. Let me repeat that. At the same time this administration is

denying California central valley agriculture 1.1 million acre-feet of their rightfully contracted water during one of the wettest years on record, it is dumping 1.4 million acre-feet of additional water into the Pacific Ocean. Mr. Speaker, this is insane.

Coleridge's lament, "Water, water everywhere but not a drop to drink," appears to have become the policy of this administration.

□ 1900

The American people did not invest billions of dollars into Federal water projects so that water can be dumped into the ocean to please environmental extremists. This policy may have been cheered by the previous Congress, but it won't be tolerated by the new majority, nor by the American people.

There was a time when the principal objective of Federal water policy was to assure an abundance of water to support a growing population and a flourishing economy. But in recent years, a radical and retrograde ideology took root in our public policy that abandoned abundance as the object of our water policy and replaced it with the government rationing of government-created shortages. I cannot imagine a more disturbing example of this ideology at work than the announcement yesterday by the Department of the Interior. Even faced with a super-abundance of water, they are determined to create and then to ration water shortages. The American people expect better and they deserve better.

They deserve a government dedicated to restoring jobs, and prosperity, and abundance, all of which is well within our reach if we will simply reverse the folly that was on full display with yesterday's announcement. Ironically, this announcement came on the same day that the President ordered his agencies to identify regulatory policies that are harming the economy. Mr. Speaker, it appears the Department of the Interior missed that memo.

CONFRONTING REALITIES WITH CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, at the outset let me stress the importance of managing our complex relationship with China in a manner that honors the transcendent principles that define America's national purpose and our identity.

Tonight, President Obama, perhaps as we speak, and President Hu Jintao will toast one another just blocks from here at the White House at an official State dinner. While appropriate for heads of State, we must remember that untold thousands in China continue to suffer horrific tortures for exercising their right to self-expression. Beijing's ruthless treatment of democracy activ-

ists and their families, Internet freedom advocates, religious minorities, and women and families victimized by a callous policy of coerced abortion and forced sterilization must continue to make us uncomfortable even as dinner is served.

Nobel Prize winner Liu Xiaobo, whose photo is right here, languishes in prison right now as his wife and family members remain under house arrest. And how many more people suffer in silence, people who have disappeared into the vast network of gulags that no human being, much less any animal, should ever have to see or experience?

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to press these points to remain deserving of our own identity as a Nation founded on freedom of religion, a Nation that embraces freedom of speech and justice, and free and fair commerce as worthy foundations for prosperity in future generations. Our China policy should reflect these transcendent and universal principles.

On the economic front, nearly \$2 trillion of debt and a bilateral trade deficit approaching \$300 billion also impose weighty concerns. We must challenge China to abandon its embrace of unbridled mercantilism, which manifests itself in massive subsidies and other trade-distorting practices that contribute to this staggering imbalance. China must know that global responsibility and accountability are inseparable.

We must, Mr. Speaker, also look ourselves in the eye and order our own fiscal affairs, revise stagnant manufacturing industries, refurbish our industrial base, and take responsibility for our economic future. We need to look closely at our willingness to place profit over principle, and to point the finger of blame at China while perpetuating our own economic dysfunction.

With regard to the future of civilization itself, China is modernizing its nuclear arsenal. China is giving cover to North Korea's nuclear program. China trades with Iran. And China has controversial plans to break with international precedent and build nuclear reactors in Pakistan. Just last week, in a show of its ever expanding projection of power, China tested a new Stealth fighter aircraft. What kind of world are our children and our allies in the Pacific standing to inherit? Neither the United States nor China can afford to allow six decades of peace and security to slip through our fingers.

Mr. Speaker, do I want a good relationship with China? Yes, absolutely. But we have a responsibility to work together to shape our complex relationship with that country, to seek meaningful progress on the tough issues, to acknowledge the positive elements of China's extraordinary culture and past civilization. However, we must do so without shrinking from challenging outright affronts to our principles and whitewashing threats to international security.